IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA EVANSVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Cause No.

v.

1:22-cr-00143-RLY-KMB-2

Indianapolis, Indiana

RICHARD SMITH,

April 10, 2025

Defendant.

Defendant.

) 2:10 p.m.

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. YOUNG

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
PLEA AND SENTENCING

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: Tiffany J. Preston

United States Attorney's Office

10 West Market Street

Suite 2100

Indianapolis, IN 46204

For the Defendant: James A. Edgar

J. Edgar Law Offices, PC

1512 North Delaware

[!ADDRESS-B2]

Indianapolis, IN 46202

Court Reporter: Elizabeth Taylor Culiver, RPR, FCRR

United States District Court

101 N.W. MLK, Jr. Blvd. Evansville, IN 47708

(812) 499-8782

PROCEEDINGS TAKEN BY MACHINE SHORTHAND
TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

I N D E X

	PAGE
JEREMY BRICE	
Direct Examination By Ms. Preston	

1 (In open court.)

THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in session. Please be seated.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MS. PRESTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We're here today in the matter of the United States of America vs. Richard Smith, 1:22-cr-143.

Mr. Smith is here in person in custody with his attorney,

James Edgar. United States is here by Assistant United States

Attorney, Tiffany Preston.

My record reflects on June 6, 2024, Court found a factual basis for the defendant's plea to Count 1, conspiracy to commit sexual exploitation of a minor, a violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 2251(a) and (e) and 2. Court further found defendant's plea was knowingly and voluntarily made.

On January 21, 2025, defendant plead guilty to

Count 6 of the original indictment, Count 4 of the trial

indictment. Court found defendant to be fully competent and

capable of entering an informed plea. In Count 6, plea was to

possession of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually

explicit conduct, a violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 2252A.

On April 3, 2025, there was a Sentencing Memorandum filed by counsel for the defendant. April 7, 2025, Sentencing Memorandum filed by the Government, and then also on April 7, 2025, a motion for restitution filed by the Government and

```
then today is the day set for sentencing.
 1
 2
             Is that your understanding of the record, Mr. Edgar?
                         That is, Your Honor.
 3
             MR. EDGAR:
                                                Thank you.
             THE COURT: Ms. Preston?
 4
 5
             MS. PRESTON: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. Mr. Edgar and
 6
 7
    Mr. Smith, do you want to come up to the lectern?
 8
             Mr. Smith, we're going to review the information
 9
    contained in your Presentence Investigation Report. If at any
    time during this proceeding you do not understand what we're
10
11
    discussing or you have a question about anything, will you
12
    make sure to make your attorney aware of your question so we
13
    can make our best attempt to answer that for you?
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
14
15
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Smith, have you had an
    opportunity to review the information contained in the
16
17
    Presentence Report?
                             Yes, Your Honor.
18
             THE DEFENDANT:
19
             THE COURT: And, Mr. Edgar, have you had an
20
    opportunity?
21
             MR. EDGAR: Yes, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: And, Ms. Preston, have you had an
23
    opportunity?
24
             MS. PRESTON: Yes, Your Honor.
25
             THE COURT: All right. I note no objections from the
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Government. The defendant has filed several objections.
Other than the objections, Mr. Smith, based upon your review
of the Presentence Investigation Report, do you find its
contents to be true and accurate?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Let's go ahead and deal with
these objections first, Mr. Edgar, and then we'll continue on
with the other information contained in the Presentence
Report.
         There's an objection to -- objection number one to
paragraph 29. Defendant Smith denies that the phone had 5,000
images. Do you wish to continue on with that objection?
         MR. EDGAR: I don't think Mr. Smith wants to continue
on with that objection, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Is that correct?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Okay. So you're withdrawing
objection number one?
         THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
         THE COURT: All right. Objection number two as to
paragraphs 34 through 36. Smith not only accepted
responsibility but successfully completed in a proffer with
the Government for which no motion was filed.
         Do you wish to continue on with that objection,
Mr. Edgar?
```

I do, Judge. I think that one's fair. 1 MR. EDGAR: 2 Okay. You wish to address it any THE COURT: 3 further? MR. EDGAR: So the Government has asked that 4 5 Mr. Smith be deprived of all points for his pleas of guilty. 6 Presumably that's related to the timing. This may bleed into 7 some of the arguments that I make at the end of this case, but 8 Mr. Smith very early on communicated his intention to accept 9 responsibility to me. We accepted the Government's invitation to sit down with them, had a very frank dialogue. Ms. Preston 10 11 can correct me if I'm wrong. By the way, Judge, she's my 12 favorite AUSA, so nothing I say can be interpreted in any way 13 as criticism of Ms. Preston. But the Government was happy. THE COURT: You -- I must say you've both done a very 14 15 thorough and professional job in this case. 16 MR. EDGAR: Thank you, Your Honor. And I need to be careful paying compliment to Assistant U.S. Attorneys because, 17 18 you know, praise from defense counsel sometimes gets 19 interpreted badly by other people, but she's great. She's 20 very reasonable. She's very professional. Extremely 21 thorough. We've tried cases together, so I'm a little worried 22 of some of what I say today might be taken as criticism of 23 her, and none of it should be interpreted that way. But the 24 Government was happy with the information. It was calculated

to prevent the further dissemination of the images.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

feedback I got at that time was that the information -- that that was likely to be successful in the preventing the further dissemination of the images, and it was a good meeting, and we left there with a positive outlook on actually getting the case resolved, and then we received a plea offer in the case later. Of course, as an inherent factor, inherent part of the federal system, you have to go and in good faith say everything you know with the hope that you'll receive some benefit for it. No quarantees.

And so what we got back was a plea offer which had every conceivable enhancement in that plea offer, everyone of them. All the ones you see in the PSI, and recommend -obviously it's going to recommend a life sentence, and Mr. Smith is not alone, so I have this kind of keyhole perspective as a defense lawyer. Like, I don't know the big I'm bias. But he's not alone because I've had other clients in the last few years put in the same situation where they're trying their best to plead guilty and then they get these terrifying plea offers with every possible enhancement programmed in there, and then I'm in that position of saying, hey, sign this. And I think based on what you read in the PSI, you can see that Mr. Smith is, probably due to some childhood issues and other post traumatic stress disorder related battles that he has to struggle with. He's not prone to trust. He's not prone to do that. Why would he? That's

my bias perspective. So it put us back on our heels, and we had to go back and forth and back and forth to try and get the case resolved, yes. There was a lot of back and forth, and it may -- you know, it might even look like the lawyers are sort of battling who's at fault or who's to blame, but you were there for part of it and you saw what we went through to get this case resolved.

Ultimately, he pled guilty to Count 6 as well, and we got the case resolved, but it took a lot of talking Mr. Smith off the wall. You can trust. You can do this. You know, ultimately, I'm going to say this. I don't mean it to sound like undue flattery, but the guidelines are not in our favor ever. I have more argument on that. So my advice to the client is you have to trust the judge because all that comes down to the judge. So we finally arrived at that point and, yeah, I'm going to admit it took some time to get there.

Mr. Smith and I had our arguments. I mean, he exasperated me. I'm just going to say that.

THE COURT: Well, difficult case --

MR. EDGAR: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- to say the least.

MR. EDGAR: Yeah. But the record also bears that out, so I think it's fair to say, and he would admit that, but we always comes back, and he's always apologetic and respectful. So we got there. We got there. I'm not saying

he was entitled to all three points, but I think there is something there.

The Court will recall that we are the ones who filed the waiver of trial by jury, and I think it's very telling that Mr. Smith recognized it was important to spare the jury the view of these images. He saw that as an important factor and, you know, with -- with respect, it's a disappointment to me that the Government will not seriously consider waiver of trial by jury, especially in cases like this. They have a blanket prohibition, and I don't think that works well for the system, but I also think that it -- it tends to show that Mr. Smith has tried to operate in good faith, and he should get the points.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Preston, any response?

MS. PRESTON: Your Honor, we filed a detailed

response in our brief and so I won't belabor that. I will, of

course, echo what Mr. Edgar has said and, again, of course, my

comments as well. I love working with Mr. Edgar, and it is

true Mr. Smith came in. He proffered with the United States.

He provided information to the United States. He did so after

charges and after his codefendant, his coconspirator, had

already provided information. That information we believe was

truthful but ultimately did not lead to a cooperation

agreement simply because the information he provided did not

yield anything that led to charges in the offense or better

understanding than we already had.

Now, with respect to -- because this was not in my brief, the enhancements in this case, Your Honor, are driven not by choices made by the United States but by the defendant's criminal conduct, and we can't wipe those away in an effort to resolve the case. If the conduct applies and the enhancement applies, we say it applies. It's the 3553(a) factors where that we weigh in discretion comes into play. As Your Honor knows, we've been before this Court many times on this case, and the United States on many occasions to resolve this matter via Plea Agreement with this particular defendant, including offers that allowed him to argue certain enhancements under the law, of course, reserving, as we have, acceptance and a decision if he's truly accepted responsibility.

It is my view, Your Honor, given what I said in my brief, and I'll be very short with it, that, one, he strategically chose to only plead guilty to 1 and 6 of this indictment. He did not choose to plead guilty to all counts in the indictment. He did so only on the eve of trial, so certainly it was not timely. And he continues to still take certain positions that I think are reflective of his lack of acceptance of truly what happened here and those arguments are all set forth in my brief, Your Honor, so I'll rest on those.

THE COURT: Thank you. Defendant did plead guilty to

Count 1 and Count 6. The Court certainly understands the position of the Government here. The defendant, by pleading guilty, avoided this matter to be tried. It would have been a lengthy trial, a very difficult trial for all involved. The Government would not waive jury. The Court would have had to bring a jury in here to view the evidence in this case, which is, to put it mildly, mostly horrific evidence, and the defendant pleading to Count 1 and 6, which the Government allowed him to do -- so the Court is going to give him consideration for that adjustment for two levels. The Government is certainly -- in its discretion is not going to move for one additional level under 1(b) and the Court certainly understands that position. So that objection will be sustained.

MR. EDGAR: Your Honor, since --

THE COURT: Two levels.

MR. EDGAR: I'm sorry. Since cooperation or attempted cooperation was specifically mentioned, I would -- if a transcript is prepared, I would ask that that be redacted or omitted or kept under seal.

THE COURT: I don't quite understand.

MR. EDGAR: I think it's in Mr. Smith's best interest and his safety if a transcript of this hearing is requested at a later date, that any mention of the cooperation be kept under seal.

1 THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right. I have no problem 2 with that. 3 MS. PRESTON: No objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: So ordered. 4 All right. Objection number three regarding 5 Defendant Smith denies the images actually 6 7 depict sex acts. Do you wish to continue with that objection? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, yes. Well, I'm kind of confused 9 on that. Are we talking about the images on the possession or 10 is it from the exploitation of the videos or -- I'm confused 11 where it's coming from because it said on some of the stuff 12 that I had read that those -- that that Count 1 stemmed from the videos. So the video that I had seen -- I don't know if 13 14 there was multiple videos taken, but the video I had seen, 15 there was -- there was never any genitalia in the one video that I seen, and that's what I had told my lawyer from --16 17 Mr. Edgar from the beginning, so I'm --18 THE COURT: Mr. Edgar, anything further on that? 19 MR. EDGAR: I don't have anything further on that, 20 Judge. That has been Mr. Smith's position from the start, 21 that at least one of these videos, if there was a sex act, it 22 was out of the frame. I know that the -- the Government -- I 23 believe they have a witness ready to testify as to the 24 contents of that video, so it would just be ultimately the

25

Court's decision.

THE COURT: Ms. Preston? 1 2 MS. PRESTON: Yes, Your Honor. We do have Detective Sergeant Jeremy Bryce who has reviewed the videos here. He 3 4 was a forensic expert in this matter, and he can very briefly 5 testify as to what he saw in those videos, and that it matches 6 the descriptions which were consistent with the guilty plea 7 and the factual basis to which Mr. Smith admitted. 8 I'm certainly -- I don't think, given the 9 description, it's necessary to play them in Court for anyone 10 to see. I think the descriptions themselves clearly depict a 11 sexual act by definition as set forth in the sentencing 12 quidelines, so we are prepared to briefly call the detective 13 sergeant to prove up that fact. 14 THE COURT: All right. You may. 15 Mr. Edgar, you and Mr. Smith can have a seat. 16 MR. EDGAR: Thank you, Your Honor. JEREMY BRICE, GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS, SWORN 17 18 DIRECT EXAMINATION 19 BY MS. PRESTON: 20 Good afternoon, Detective Sergeant. Can you please 0. 21 introduce yourself to the Court and spell your first and last 22 name for the court reporter, please? 23 Detective Sergeant Jeremy Brice. Spelling of the first

Q. Prior to coming to Court today, did you provide to the

name is J-e-r-e-m-y. Last name Brice, B, as in boy, r-i-c-e.

- 1 United States what we have marked in our sentencing memorandum
- 2 as Exhibit E, that being your curriculum vita setting forth
- 3 | your qualifications?
- 4 A. I did.
- 5 Q. And are those qualifications correct?
- 6 A. They are.
- 7 Q. In addition to that background and training, which is
- 8 set forth in Exhibit E, are you familiar with the federal
- 9 definition of child pornography?
- 10 A. I am.
- 11 MS. PRESTON: And I believe as set forth in our
- 12 filing regarding your expert qualifications, Mr. Edgar, do you
- 13 | stipulate that Detective Sergeant Brice is an expert in the
- 14 | field of forensic examination of devices?
- 15 MR. EDGAR: We would agree with that, Your Honor.
- 16 BY MS. PRESTON:
- 17 | Q. So moving on, Your Honor, I want to keep this as
- 18 efficient as possible. For the record, Detective Sergeant,
- 19 | did you work on the matter of the United States of America vs.
- 20 | Richard Smith and Jamie Powell?
- 21 A. I did.
- 22 Q. In what capacity?
- 23 A. I conducted the digital forensic examinations of the
- 24 | digital evidence that was provided to me, conducting the
- 25 acquisition of the devices, as well as the examination of the

- 1 data contained in those devices.
- 2 Q. And did that examination include Ms. Powell's A50
- 3 | smartphone Model SMS506DL?
- 4 A. It did.
- 5 Q. And did it also include Mr. Smith's Samsung Galaxy Note
- 6 20 Model SMN981U?
- 7 A. It did.
- 8 Q. Based on that examination, did you create several
- 9 summary exhibits in this matter?
- 10 A. I did.
- 11 Q. And have you reviewed those prior to coming to court
- 12 today?
- 13 A. Yes, I have.
- 14 \mathbb{Q} . And one of them, I believe, is on the screen in front of
- 15 | Your Honor and perhaps in front of you since your screen is
- 16 | not working, and it is referred to the summary of Mr. Smith's
- 17 | Samsung Galaxy Note 20, correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 MS. PRESTON: And for the record, Your Honor, I
- 20 | believe that is Exhibit D in the sentencing memo.
- 21 BY MS. PRESTON:
- 22 | O. And you also created a summary marked as Exhibit I of
- 23 your findings with respect to Ms. Powell's cellular device; is
- 24 | that correct?
- 25 A. I did.

- 1 Q. Did you -- could you very briefly describe how you
- 2 extracted those devices, including best practices?
- 3 A. I did. When the evidence comes into our office, we do
- 4 various things to ensure that the evidence is not manipulated
- 5 | in any further way, including putting it on airplane mode and
- 6 disconnecting it from any wireless networks. In doing so, it
- 7 prevents any tampering of the data. We then use forensic
- 8 software to extract the data in as complete of a way as
- 9 possible. In these cases, I did a -- what's called a full
- 10 | file system extraction, which would be the most complete way
- 11 to acquire data using modern technologies. Using that
- 12 | information, we were able to then process that data and put
- 13 that full file system data into a readable format for our
- 14 examination.
- 15 Q. Okay. And I'd like to turn your attention, given
- 16 Mr. Smith's withdraw of his objection regarding the number of
- 17 | images and videos of child sex abuse material on his phone.
- 18 Let's turn next to the videos that were set forth in Counts 1,
- 19 \parallel 2, 3 -- 1, 2, and 3 of the indictment and the image described
- 20 | in Count 4. Okay?
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. As part of your forensic analysis in this case, have you
- 23 reviewed those videos and that image?
- 24 A. I have.
- 25 Q. And did you create at one point in time a table

- 1 including the descriptions of those videos?
- 2 A. I did.
- 3 Q. And you have watched them from the beginning to the end;
- 4 | is that right?
- 5 A. Multiple times, yes.
- 6 MS. PRESTON: And for the record, Your Honor, they
- 7 | are described not only in the indictment but in the stipulated
- 8 factual basis as to Count 1. And I will pull up now the
- 9 exhibit to which Detective Sergeant Brice is referring, and
- 10 that being Exhibit K to the sentencing memo. And I'm going to
- 11 | try to make it a little larger here.
- 12 BY MS. PRESTON:
- 13 Q. Okay. Did you assist -- and this is -- Exhibit K is
- 14 Counts 2, 3, and 4. Do you have that in front of you, sir?
- 15 \mathbb{A} . I do. I believe this is the correct form.
- 16 Q. That's correct. I'm sorry. I didn't bring your glasses
- 17 today.
- 18 Looking at videos described in Counts 2 and 3,
- 19 particularly the descriptions of those videos, are those
- 20 descriptions consistent with your examination of those videos
- 21 and were contained on Mr. Smith's devices?
- 22 A. They are.
- 23 Q. And for the record, did the video depicted in Count 2
- 24 ending in 9029 depict Minor Victim 1?
- 25 A. It did.

- 1 Q. Was it approximately 16 seconds in length?
- 2 A. It was.
- 3 Q. And did that video depict Minor Victim 1 in a onesie
- 4 | that was unsnapped laying down on her back?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Is Mr. Powell's hand showing her tattoos visible and
- 7 | seen prying open Minor Victim 1's genitalia?
- 8 A. It was.
- 9 Q. Did she use her index finger and thumb in order to pry
- 10 open her genitalia?
- 11 A. She did.
- 12 Q. Was the focal point of that video file the opening of
- 13 | Minor Victim 1's genitalia?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And could you then hear in the video another child's
- 16 voice saying, "What are you doing?"
- 17 A. I did hear that.
- 18 Q. Did Ms. Powell's hand then remove off of the genitalia
- 19 of Minor Victim 1?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Accordingly, Detective Sergeant Brice, does the video
- 22 described in Count 2, which is the subject matter of Count 1,
- 23 the conspiracy count, depict the penetration, however slight,
- 24 of the genital opening of Minor Victim 1 by someone's hand or
- 25 finger?

- 1 A. It did.
- 2 Q. Did it also depict the intentional touching, not through
- 3 | the clothing of Minor Victim 1's genitalia?
- 4 A. It did.
- 5 Q. And was she under the age of 16 at the time?
- 6 A. Yes, she was.
- 7 Q. And that video found its way from Ms. Powell's cellular
- 8 device onto Mr. Smith's cellular device; is that correct?
- 9 A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. I'd like to turn now to Count 3.
- MS. PRESTON: Which, again, these videos, Your Honor,
- 12 were part and parcel of Count 1 to which Mr. Smith pleaded
- 13 guilty.
- 14 BY MS. PRESTON:
- 15 \parallel Q. Did you review the video ending in 7725?
- 16 A. I did.
- 17 Q. And is the description as set forth in Exhibit K
- 18 consistent with your review of that video?
- 19 A. It is.
- 20 Q. Is that video approximately seven seconds in length?
- 21 \blacksquare A. Approximately eight seconds is what I had, but yes.
- 22 Q. Does it depict a female subject consistent with Powell,
- 23 again, appearing to change Minor Victim 1's diaper?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 || Q. Did she then position the camera between the legs of

- 1 Minor Victim 1 who was in an unsnapped onesie with no diaper?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Can Powell then be seen placing her head between Minor
- 4 Victim 1's feet and proceed to kiss Minor Victim 1's toes?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Does she then place her head and mouth on Minor
- 7 | Victim 1's exposed genitalia?
- 8 A. She does.
- 9 Q. And began to kiss her mouth onto Minor Victim 1's
- 10 exposed genitalia?
- 11 A. That is what I observed.
- 12 Q. Does she then raise her head and repeat the action
- 13 | again?
- 14 A. She did.
- 15 Q. And then kiss Minor Victim 1's feet gazing at the camera
- 16 as she's doing so?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And, again, from your review then of this record, does
- 19 the video ending in 7725 depict contact between Ms. Powell's
- 20 mouth and the genitalia, namely the vulva of Minor Victim 1?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Turning finally to the image described as image number
- 23 | 17. Does that image -- have you reviewed that image as well?
- 24 A. I have.
- 25 Q. And it is the subject matter of Count 4 of the original

- 1 | indictment, correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Okay. And does it depict Ms. Powell's hand with her
- 4 tattoos visible using a thumb to pry open Minor Victim 1's
- 5 | genitalia?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. So, again, based or your review, does that image depict
- 8 | the penetration, however slight, of the genital opening of
- 9 | Minor Victim 1 by hand or finger?
- 10 A. It does.
- 11 Q. All right. And it is also depicting intentional
- 12 touching not through the clothing of Minor Victim 1's
- genitalia when she was under the age of 16; is that correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Based on your review of those videos and that image
- 16 which were the subject matters of 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the
- 17 | original indictment, does that depict child pornography by
- 18 | federal definition?
- 19 A. It does.
- 20 Q. Including a sex act?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 MS. PRESTON: Your Honor, I have no further questions
- 23 for the witness on this particular objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 25 Mr. Edgar, any questions for the witness?

- 1 MR. EDGAR: I do have some cross, Judge. Would
- 2 Mr. Smith accompany me for this?
- THE COURT: He can if he wishes.
- 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MR. EDGAR:
- 6 Q. Sir, regarding the image with the lengthy number ending
- 7 in 9029, I believe that's a 16 second video?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Where did you, yourself, locate that image -- that
- 10 series of images?
- 11 A. That video was located on both devices, both the female
- 12 codefendant's as well as Richard Smith's.
- 13 Q. And were you able to determine when that file was
- 14 actually received or placed on Mr. Smith's phone?
- 15 A. There would have been four copies of that video on his
- 16 phone, and they would've all been on January 28th of 2021 with
- 17 | varying time stamps all around between 3:11 and 3:58 p.m.
- 18 Q. Can you elaborate on that, please? Does that tell us
- 19 when those images actually appeared on the phone that we're
- 20 | talking about?
- 21 A. Yes. So the way --
- 22 THE COURT: You're talking about Mr. Smith's phone?
- MR. EDGAR: Correct. Thank you, Judge.
- 24 \blacksquare A. So from our understanding of the way the videos cross
- 25 | all of the images and videos were transferred from one phone

- to the other, they were transferred there, placed into a secure folder, an encrypted folder on that phone, and so we were able to get some modification date stamps of when those
- 4 were placed on the phone, and so we had copies of it.
- And I misspoke a little bit earlier. There was one copy that was on January 22nd of 2021, and then three copies that were on January 28th of 2021 that were placed on that device based on the modification date stamps that we located
- 10 BY MR. EDGAR:

11 Q. Are you able to tell us if Mr. Smith actually accessed

forensically on those images -- sorry, on the video.

- 12 those files?
- 13 A. There would not be any forensic information to show that
- 14 | he specifically accessed those files. I can see that based on
- 15 the modification stamp, the date stamp, that's when they were
- 16 placed on the device, but I can't tell you, you know, that the
- 17 \parallel -- the user specifically accessed them at certain times.
- 18 Q. Can't tell us whether it was ever opened?
- 19 A. In order for it to be placed on the device, though, it
- 20 | would've had to have been opened in a way to copy it.
- Q. You couldn't do that just by copying one -- the contents
- 22 of OneDrive to the phone?
- 23 A. I guess in order to copy the file, you'd have to
- 24 manually, I guess, open the file to copy it. I see -- I guess
- 25 you're trying to get to, like, did he actually view the full

- 1 | video? No, I wouldn't have any date stamp to say every time
- 2 | that full video would be viewed.
- 3 \mathbb{Q} . Is it possible to batch -- sort of copy those over in a
- 4 batch?
- 5 A. Yeah, that's perfectly possible and likely did occur in
- 6 this case.
- 7 Q. Okay. Now, the image with the long number ending in
- 8 7725, Mr. Smith's position has been that if there was a sex
- 9 act, it was not depicted in the frame of that image. Do you
- 10 understand what I'm trying to describe? It was a horrible
- 11 question.
- Can you tell us whether the sex act is actually
- 13 depicted in the frame, or do you have to use your imagination
- 14 | to figure out what was going on?
- 15 A. In the video itself, you can't see Minor Victim 1's
- 16 genitalia, but when the act did occur and the mouth did touch
- 17 \parallel the vulva area, you can see the -- the skin or the pubis mons,
- 18 I guess, bulge in a way to where you can see that there was
- 19 | contact made with the vulva, but no, you can't see the actual
- 20 genitalia in the -- in the framing of it.
- 21 MR. EDGAR: Okay. That may be all the questions I
- 22 | have. Is there anything else you wanted on that?
- 23 THE DEFENDANT: I mean, when I -- when I did the
- 24 proffer -- when I first did the proffer --
- 25 THE COURT: Hold on.

- 1 THE DEFENDANT: Sorry.
- THE COURT: Talk to your attorney first.
- 3 (Off the record.)
- 4 MR. EDGAR: It sounds like that's more in the line of
- 5 testimony from Mr. Smith rather than a question for the agent.
- 6 I think that's all the questions we have.
- 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Preston?
- 8 MS. PRESTON: Yes, Your Honor, if I may.

9 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

- 10 BY MS. PRESTON:
- 11 Q. I want to turn back to Exhibit D, if we can. And where
- 12 did -- if you're looking at Exhibit D, it says in Exhibit D
- 13 that the files were filtered to a folder. And that folder had
- 14 | a name, didn't it?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. What was the name?
- 17 | A. The name of the folder was "incestuous pedophile
- 18 mother."
- 19 Q. And when -- and that folder was contained on Mr. Smith's
- 20 | phone, correct?
- 21 A. That is correct.
- 22 | Q. How would you go about making a folder with that
- 23 specific title? It didn't come with the phone, right?
- 24 A. That's correct. You would've had to manually create
- 25 | that folder name.

- 1 Q. In addition to that, were there other file names that
- 2 you saw on some of the videos and images that are depicted --
- 3 or sorry, that were stored onto Mr. Smith's phone?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And I want to scroll down here to January 22nd, 2021.
- 6 Do you see one said title -- or sorry, a few of those said
- 7 | titles there?
- 8 A. I do.
- 9 Q. And can you please read those into the record?
- 10 A. So January 22nd, 2021, there was four specific file
- 11 names that I located that were manually created. One of them
- 12 was "almost 2 year old" and then --
- 13 THE COURT: Excuse me. And these are on Mr. Smith's
- 14 phone?
- THE WITNESS: Yes, they are.
- 16 A. "Almost 2 year old," and then it had Minor Victim 1's
- 17 | name, "baby cunt," and then a bracket with a 1.jpg. So it's
- 18 going to be an image file with that file name. There was also
- 19 another file name "more of" and it had Minor Victim 1's name,
- 20 | "almost 2 year old baby cunt.jpg." And then there's another
- 21 | file called "Jamie Powell 39" with -- and then, again, Minor
- 22 | Victim 1's name, "2 panty play.jpg." And, again, "almost 2
- 23 | year old" and Minor Victim 1's name, "baby cunt.jpg."
- 24 BY MS. PRESTON:
- 25 Q. Now, those titles, again, weren't naturally created when

- 1 | the video or image was created by Ms. Powell's phone, correct?
- 2 A. That is correct.
- 3 || Q. That is a title that had to have been selected by the
- 4 user of the device, correct?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And who was the user of that device?
- 7 A. That would have been Richard Smith.
- 8 Q. And the titles of those, just by way of example, images
- 9 were consistent with what the images showed; is that right?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Indicating that, at least for those, they had been, in
- 12 | fact, opened, correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And the entire folder had a title that matched the types
- 15 of images and videos that were in Mr. Smith's phone, correct?
- 16 A. That is correct.
- 17 MS. PRESTON: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 18 THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Edgar?
- 19 MR. EDGAR: I don't think we have any questions on
- 20 that, Judge. Mr. Smith has continued to offer me comments.
- 21 | Perhaps that would be appropriate testimony from him, but I
- 22 don't know if it's the best way to proceed, but no questions.
- 23 THE COURT: Sir, thank you very much for your
- 24 | testimony. You may step down.
- 25 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Edgar, would you and Mr. Smith come back up?

Based on the testimony we've heard here today and the Court's review of the file and recalling the stipulated factual basis, the four level enhancement is appropriate here, and, of course, United States Code defines sexual act, among others, by penetration, however slight, of the anal or genital opening by -- of another by hand or finger or by any object with the intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person. That applies here regarding file number referred to in paragraph 22 of the Presentence Report, last four digits 9029, and, of course, the testimony we just heard from the witness regarding the naming of the files. Certainly Mr. Smith had to view these files to be able to have such a descriptive title of the file. So that objection will be denied. And that appropriate -- four level enhancement at paragraph 41 is appropriate.

Okay. Objection number four. Smith did not engage in distribution. Smith merely received the images from the flash drive. Do you wish to continue with that objection?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you wish to withdraw that objection, Mr. Smith?

I don't know what to do, Your Honor, 1 THE DEFENDANT: 2 to be honest. I don't know what to do. 3 MR. EDGAR: May I have a moment, Judge? 4 THE COURT: You may. 5 (Off the record.) MR. EDGAR: He would like to maintain the objection, 6 7 In summary, he denies that he distributed any images Judge. 8 to Jamie Powell. He may have viewed them with her. 9 THE COURT: All right. Any response, Ms. Preston? 10 MS. PRESTON: Yes, Your Honor. As set forth on -- in 11 our sentencing memorandum and as set forth in Exhibit D, what 12 the forensics show in this case, Your Honor, is that the offense -- that's the test. The offense itself and the 13 14 offense is conspiracy to sexually exploit a child involved 15 distribution. Here as -- if you recall from my brief, as well 16 as the evidence in this case, Mr. Smith, quite persistently and obsessively, asked Ms. Powell to produce images and videos 17 18 depicting sexually explicit conduct of her daughter. 19 Ms. Powell, because of their conspiratorial agreement, agreed 20 to create those images and videos, and they were not created 21 for Ms. Powell. They were created for Mr. Smith. Part in 22 parcel of this conspiratorial agreement contemplated 23 distribution, which is forensically what we saw happen. 24 The images and videos were created by Ms. Powell of

Minor Victim 1 while they were at the Laser Center. Then, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as admitted by this defendant in his change of plea hearings, Ms. Powell then distributed those images and videos to Mr. Smith who, yes, received them. So yes, the offense involved distribution. That was the entire point of this conspiracy, to satisfy the sexual gratification of this particular defendant by the viewing of the images and videos that they conspired to create. The forensics prove that fact, Your Honor. As you can see in Exhibit D of the Sentencing Memorandum, the images and videos are first created on Powell's phone, then they are shown to be saved at a later time onto Mr. Smith's phone. Mr. Smith admitted in the stipulated factual basis to the -- we used words transmission, which is also in the sentencing guidelines, the transmission of those images and videos. He also told Your Honor in his own words how they accomplished that distribution. That being either through a Bluetooth to Bluetooth device or also potentially via flash drive. And so the offense of conviction, yes, involved distribution.

In addition to that, Your Honor, we are also aware, both forensically and from Mr. Smith's admissions, that he had a collection of internet based child pornography of more than 5,000 images. He shared some of those images and videos, approximately 2,500 of them, with Ms. Powell, and those images and videos matched those hash values found on this phone and were located on her phone. And so based on that evidence,

Your Honor, we believe the United States has more than proven that the offense of conviction involved distribution.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further, Mr. Edgar?

MR. EDGAR: Not from me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The Court recalls the stipulated factual basis entered into by the parties. Also, the evidence that the Court has reviewed, the evidence contained in the Sentencing Memorandum filed by the Government, and certainly application note 6 of Section 2G2.1 regarding the defendant knowingly engaged in distribution if he, A, knowingly committed the distribution or, B, aided abetted, counseled, commanded, induced, procured, or willfully caused the distribution, or, C, conspired to distribute.

As detailed in text messages conversations between the defendant and his codefendant, Jamie Powell, referred to at paragraphs 18 and 20 of the Presentence Report, the defendant did aid, abet, counsel, and certainly commanded and induced his codefendant, Ms. Powell, to produce and distribute the sexual abuse material of Minor Victim 1. So that objection is overruled and that enhancement certainly applies.

All right. Objection five to paragraphs 51 and 62. Smith denies engaging in a pattern of sexual abuse. File number video, last four digits, 7725 does not depict child sexual abuse. Points under Section 4B1.(5)(b)(1) counted twice in paragraph -- regarding paragraphs 51 and 62.

1 Do you wish to continue with that objection 2 Mr. Edgar? 3 THE DEFENDANT: No. THE COURT: You wish to withdraw that? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: All right. We'll show that objection 7 withdrawn. And I think that takes care of all the objections, 8 9 Mr. Edgar; is that correct? 10 MR. EDGAR: I think so, Judge. 11 THE COURT: And as I indicated earlier, the 12 Government did not have objections. All right. So based on your review of the 13 14 Presentence Report, Mr. Smith, do you find its contents to be 15 true and accurate? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. His codefendant, Jamie 17 18 Powell, entered a plea of guilty and Plea Agreement. She was found guilty on June 6 of 2024. Sentencing is pending. 19 20 History of the charge contained in Part A. On 21 October 4, 2022, a six-count indictment was filed naming the 22 defendant and codefendant, Jamie Powell. Count 1 charges the 23 conspiracy to commit sexual exploitation of a minor. Counts 2 24 through 4 charged defendant with and codefendant with sexual 25 exploitation of a minor and attempt committed between

December 2020 and on or about February of 2021. Count 5 charges defendant with receipt of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct. And Count 6 charged the defendant with possession of visual depictions of minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct. There's also a forfeiture allegation regarding computers, cell phones, and other communication devices.

October 4, 2022, a warrant was issued for the defendant's arrest. On October 6, 2022, the Court issued a writ commanding the presence of the defendant, who was confined at that time at the Indiana Department of Correction, commanding him to be presented before the District Court of the Southern District of Indiana to answer the prosecution of this case.

October 18, 2022, defendant appeared before the Court, ordered detained. On April 11, 2024, there was an accept or reject hearing. Defendant declined to plea offer at that time. On May 20, 2024, petition to enter a plea of guilty and a request for preparation of Presentence Report was filed. Defendant agreed to plead to Count 1, the conspiracy.

June 3rd, 2024, a motion for preliminary order of forfeiture was filed regarding the items, cellphones, handwritten letters, other items listed in the Presentence Report. That motion was granted by the Court on June 5, 2024. On June 6th, 2024, change of plea hearing was held. At the

time -- at that time, Mr. Smith pled guilty to Count 1, signed a stipulated factual basis for the plea. Defendant was adjudged guilty at that time.

August 26, 2024, petition to enter a plea of guilty to Count 6 was filed. January 8, 2025, the Court granted defendant's -- granted the Government's motion to dismiss Count 5. On January 17, 2025, defendant pled guilty to Count 6 of the indictment, possession of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct. Stipulated factual basis was filed with the Court.

Offense conduct is listed in paragraphs 15
through 30. Parties indicating to the Court the information
contained in the Presentence Report is true and accurate, the
Court will adopt the findings of the probation officer
regarding the offense conduct as its own findings regarding
the nature and circumstances of the offense.

I'm not going to go through all of it, but just a summary of what we have here. Defendant and Jamie Powell, known as Jamie Cramer, were residents of the Southern District of Indiana. Jamie Powell is the mother of five children, including Minor Victim 1, who was born in May of 2019. Minor Witness No. 1, initials H.P., born in August of 2005. Minor Witness 2, initials E.P., born in 2017. B.P., who was born in 2003, and A.P., who was born in 2004.

The defendant knew Minor Victim 1 was under the age

of 18 in 2020 and 2021. In or around early 2020, the

Department of Child Services filed to terminate Jamie Powell's

parental rights. Powell relocated to an apartment in

Anderson, Indiana, and resided with the defendant, Richard

Smith. During this time period, Powell and Smith were in a

romantic relationship, resided together in Anderson between

late 2020 and approximately February 4, 2021. Smith is not

the biological father of any of Powell's children.

Beginning in late 2020 and early 2021, Smith and Powell began communicating in person and using their cell phones regarding Smith's sexual interest in Powell's minor children and bestiality. During those text messages, Smith and Powell agreed and conspired for Powell to employ, use, persuade, induce, entice, and coerce a minor, Minor Victim 1, to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing any visual depiction of such conduct.

Defendant Smith knew that Powell was Minor Victim 1's mother and that as such, she had physical access to Minor Victim 1 during supervised visits while Minor Victim 1 was in Indiana Department of Children Services custody. Defendant Smith knew that Minor Victim 1 was less than two years old during the time she was sexually exploited.

For example, on or about January 31, 2021, the following messages were exchanged between Smith and Powell describing Smith's desire to sexually exploit Powell's

children, including Minor Victim 1, and Powell's desire to help.

I'm not going to recite the transcript of those calls, but the Court agrees and finds and certainly there appears to be no objection to this transcript that the defendant is requesting sexually explicit photos and video and codefendant Powell is agreeing to provide those to him.

In late 2020, early 2021, codefendant Powell was permitted to have supervised visitation with Minor Victim 1 and Minor Witness 2. The supervised visitation took place at a Court supervised facility in Muncie, Indiana. The supervised visits with Powell, Minor Victim 1 and Witness Victim 1, one of Powell's other children, were monitored by a DCS contract supervisor and were court ordered.

Between approximately December 2020 and approximately February 2021 and during Powell's court ordered visitation with Minor Victim 1 and Minor Witness 2 in Muncie, Indiana, Powell waited until the DCS contractor was not looking and intentionally produced numerous images and videos of Minor Victim 1. These images included, but were not limited to, the following, which were produced and saved onto Powell's Samsung A50 smartphone.

And these are file numbers, last four digits, 9029, which were previously referred to, and 7725. Also there's a file image, image number 17 as well.

Each of these videos and images constitute child sex abuse material as they depicted Minor Victim 1 engaged in sexually explicit conduct and sexual contact. The defendant conspired with Powell for Powell to produce the videos and image described pursuant to their conspiratorial agreements as charged in Count 1 among other images and videos and that Powell distributed the videos and images as described above to the defendant Smith.

Between on or about December 2020 and on or about
February 2021, defendant knowingly and unlawfully conspired
and agreed with Powell to employ, use, persuade, induce, and
entice and coerce Minor Victim 1, who was under the age of 18,
to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of
producing any visual depiction of such conduct, knowing and
having reason to know that such visual depiction would be
transported using any means and facility of interstate and
foreign commerce and effecting interstate and foreign commerce
certainly by cell phone. These visual depiction were actually
transported and transmitted by means and facility of
interstate or foreign commerce.

Powell and Smith exchanged text messages, images, and videos through internet connections and interstate wire communications discussing the sexually exploitation of minors and attempted sexual exploitation of minors, including Minor Victim 1. Powell produced and attempted to produce videos and

images of Minor Victim 1 that depicted sexually explicit conduct as defined in 18 U.S. Code Section 2256 subsection 2. And Powell transmitted those images and videos through internet connections and wire communications to Smith. The images and videos that Smith and Powell conspired to produce impacted interstate or foreign commerce and that -- and that the cell phone Powell used was manufactured outside the State of Indiana. Defendant Smith further admits the Samsung Galaxy Note 20 5G smartphone was manufactured outside the State of Indiana.

As to Count 6, between on or about December 2020 and on or about February 2021, defendant knowingly possessed visual depictions that had been mailed, shipped, or transported via interstate and foreign commerce by any means including computer. Production of visual depictions involve the use of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct and sexual contact. Smith saved and possessed the images and video files of child sex abuse material on his Samsung Galaxy note 20 5G smartphone. The material included a prepubescent minor or a minor who had not attained the age of 12. Smith's smartphone was manufactured outside of Indiana. And there are many file names listed in the Presentence Investigation Report, and there's been no objection to those file names, and those files contain sexually explicit material involving prepubescent minors or a minor who had not attained the age of

12.

On February 4, 2021, defendant was arrested on an outstanding warrant for a violation of probation and participation terms of the Henry County drug court. While he was incarcerated at the Indiana Department of Correction facility, his cell phone, a Samsung Galaxy Note 20 5G smartphone remained at codefendant Powell's residence. As a result, Powell and Smith began communicating via the inmate messaging application Global Tel Link or GTL on or about March 24, 2021.

On or about July 26, 2021, Indiana Department of Correction contacted the Indiana State Police regarding messages between Powell and Smith as to the potential endangerment or exploitation of Minor Victim 1. Detectives then obtained a search warrant and searched Powell's residence recovering numerous devices to include Powell's cell phone. Powell's cell phone was forensically examined and revealed images and videos she produced at Smith's direction of Minor Victim 1 at the Indiana DCS contracted facility. Powell was charged on April 25, 2022.

Later the United States received information regarding another Samsung cell phone attributed to Smith that was provided to Powell's children to use after his arrest.

The Samsung Galaxy 5G smartphone was later recovered from Powell's son, B.P., on August 29, 2022, and was forensically

examined. It revealed approximately 492 media files, specifically images or videos, that were recovered in a second encrypted folder of the same or similar child pornography found on Powell's cell phone. Specifically, the approximately 492 files depicted images and videos of sexually explicit conduct involving Powell and Minor Victim 1 as well as approximately 5,000 images of other child pornography and bestiality. Many of the media files were stored in a subfolder of the secured encrypted folder named "incestuous pedophile," the names of codefendant Powell and Minor Victim 1.

Digital forensic examination also extracted additional child sex abuse material on the Samsung A50 smartphone, particularly approximately 2,400 image files of child pornography and approximately 170 files of bestiality. The child pornography was recovered from the encrypted partition feature in the Samsung devices known as a, quote, secure folder unenabled by default.

Victim impact. Of course, the victims of these offenses are Minor Victim 1 in Count 1 and all the other children that were portrayed in the images possessed by the defendant as charged in Count 6.

On September 24, 2024, the Government advised the National Center For Exploited Children, reports were received reflecting a total of 971 total videos or images and 131 total

series were identified. The victims have been notified; however, no request for restitution or victim impact have been received to date. Restitution, of course, is mandatory and that will be determined by the Court.

Adjustment for obstruction of justice. There's no information indicating defendant impeded or obstructed justice. As I indicated earlier, I find the defendant did accept responsibility in Count 1 and Count 6. The Court finds that two levels shall be reduced regarding that acceptance. The Government will not make a motion regarding 3E1.1(b).

Offense level computation. The 2024 manual was used. Because the incidents involved separate harms to separate victims, the charges in Counts 1 and 6 are not grouped.

Count 1, sexual exploitation of a minor and attempt regarding Minor Victim 1. Base offense level is 32. Specific offense characteristic one, the offense involved a minor who had not attained the age of 12. Specifically, she was 18 months.

Four levels are added.

Specific offense characteristic two. The offense involved the commission of a sexual act. Two levels are added.

Specific offense characteristic three. Defendant knowingly engaged in distribution. Two levels are added.

Specific offense characteristic four. Defendant knowingly possessed material that portrayed a sadistic or

masochistic conduct or other depictions of violence or an infant or toddler. Four levels are added.

Victim related adjustments. There are none. No other adjustments. A subtotal of 44.

As to Count 6, possession of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct. Base offense level is 18. Specific offense characteristic one, the offense involved material that portrays a prepubescent minor or a minor who had not attained the age of 12. Two levels are added.

Specific offense characteristic two. The offense involved material that portrays sexual abuse or the exploitation of an infant or a toddler. Four levels are added.

Specific offense characteristic three. The defendant engaged in a pattern of activity involving the sexual abuse or exploitation of a minor. Pursuant to the guidelines, five levels are added.

Specific offense characteristic four, the offense involved the use of a computer or interactive computer and service for the possession, transmission, receipt, or distribution of material. Two levels are added. However, I think as counsel knows, my practice and thoughts on this specific offense characteristic — today all these offenses are committed by computer, and so the Court will not assess

this specific offense characteristic.

Specific offense characteristic five. The offense involved more than 600 images or videos. Five levels are added. No other adjustments. We have a subtotal of 34.

Multiple count adjustments. Units are assigned pursuant to 3D1.4(a)(b) and (c). We have Count 1. Adjusted offense level is 44. Assigned one unit. Count 6, adjusted offense level is 34. Assigned .5 units. Total number of units 1.5. The greater of the adjusted offense levels is 44. Increase the offense level pursuant to 3D1.4, we had one. Combined adjusted offense level is 45.

Chapter 4 Enhancements. The offense of conviction is a covered sex crime. Neither 4B1.1, the career offender, nor Subsection A of 4B1.5 applies and the defendant engaged in a pattern of activity involving prohibited sexual conduct; therefore, the defendant is a repeat and dangerous sex offender against minors. The offense level shall be five plus the offense level determined in Chapters 2 and 3, so we now have an applicable offense level of 50. As I indicated earlier, acceptance of responsibility, we'll subtract two levels. Total offense level is 48. However, pursuant to Chapter 5, Part A, the comment at Note 2, there are rare instances where the total offense level as calculated in excess of 43, and, therefore, the offense level will be treated as a Level 43.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Defendant's criminal history. I find no juvenile referrals. Adult criminal convictions begin with arrest in Theft, a felony, in Marion County, Indiana. Pursuant 2004. to 4A1.2(e)(3), zero criminal history points assessed. September of 2005, age 23, residential entry in Marion County, Indiana, zero criminal history points assessed. November 10, 2008, obstruction of justice, a felony, Marion County, Indiana. Zero criminal history points assessed. October 15, 2013, dealing in methamphetamine, an amount 13 grams or more, a felony, in Henry Circuit Court. June of 2014, received 16 years at the Indiana Department of Correction, six years suspended, two years formal probation. Pursuant to 4A1.1(3), three criminal history points are assessed. Defendant was released from IDOC to probation in 2015, placed on drug court program in 2018. 2021, his drug court was terminated, probation revoked, sentenced to 3,958 days Department of Correction. July of 2018, charged with possession of methamphetamine, a felony, in Henry County Circuit Court. March 4, 2021, received five years Department of Correction, consecutive to another cause number, fine and costs. Pursuant 4A1.1(a), three criminal history points assessed. February of 2021, battery with bodily injury to a public safety officer, a felony, in the Henry Circuit Court. August 5, 2021, received four years Indiana Department of Correction consecutive to other cause numbers. Pursuant to 4A1.1(a), three criminal

history points are assessed.

Criminal convictions result in a subtotal criminal history score of nine. Defendant was under a criminal justice sentence of probation for that conviction and sentence referred to in paragraph 70 of the Presentence Report at the time of the instant offense; therefore, one criminal history point is added. Total criminal history score is ten, placing him in Category V. No other criminal conduct. No pending charges. Other arrests back in 2018 for auto theft, those charges were dismissed.

Background. Defendant was born in California in 1982, his father, Derek Smith, and mother, Lois Smith. However, defendant was primarily raised by his paternal step-grandmother, Deborah Stewart, age 72 now. When defendant was a child, step-grandmother maintained employment with a company in California. Dedicated her time to caring for the handicapped and mentally ill until retirement. She now resides in Indiana. Defendant indicates he and his step-grandmother share a phenomenal relationship and communicate daily.

Defendant does have a lengthy criminal history -- or excuse me, defendant's father has a very lengthy criminal history, was in and out of prison for most of defendant's life. Father now resides in Indiana and is disabled. Does not have any information regarding his mother. Last

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

communicated with his mother nine years ago. Defendant indicates his mother and father both battled long-term drug addictions.

Defendant has maternal half siblings, Charlos Knight and Desirae Smith. Desiree is now deceased. Also have 12 paternal half siblings from with whom he does not share a close relationship.

Defendant describes a solemn childhood history of abuse and abandonment. Very few positive memories of his childhood. Recounted being physically abused by his mother beginning at age four or five and molested by his mother's best friend and her husband. Molested by his maternal uncle. Indicates he further comes from a long line of drug addicts. When he was nine years old, his paternal grandmother was reportedly murdered while at a bar, killed over, quote, alcohol and men. Maternal grandmother murdered by teenagers when the defendant was 11.

Despite his basic needs being met, he lived in a, quote, really tough neighborhood. Mr. Smith indicates he felt invisible at home. He -- it was his grandmother, his grandfather's wife, who primarily cared for him. Defendant reportedly ran away from his grandparents' house approximately 30 times, sleep outside, obtain food from trash cans. Eventually began selling and using drugs.

Defendant met and later married April Beaver in

Marion County, Indiana, when he was approximately 20. They have a daughter, age 20. Defendant has not had contact with his daughter since her first birthday. Defendant and his wife are now divorced. His daughter was eventually adopted by her stepdad, and she and the defendant are estranged.

Defendant and Nicole Ostertag had a 17-year off and on relationship. They share one child, age 13. Resides with his mother in New Castle.

Defendant and codefendant, Jamie Powell, reportedly engaged in an off and on casual sexual relationship for 16 years. Defendant resided in California until age 16.

Thereafter went to Liberty, Indiana, for approximately six months.

Had a rebellious teenage behavior. Grandmother sent him back to California to live with his grandfather. Stayed until age 18. Returned to Indiana. Imprisoned at Indiana Youth Center for approximately two and a half years.

Defendant's physical condition. He indicates he doesn't have any significant physical ailments. He was diagnosed with asthma at birth. When asked to describe his current physical health, he stated he is obese; otherwise, reports no health concerns.

Mental and emotional health. Reportedly diagnosed with post traumatic stress disorder sometime prior to his arrest in New Castle, Indiana. Denied suffering any

additional mental health issues but shared he has had four prior suicide attempts over the years.

Court records reflect on November 9, 2005, he was ordered to complete 26 weeks of domestic violence counseling as a condition of probation. He also completed the Bridges to Life Victim Impact class while in prison at the Department of Correction. Prior IDOC status report reflects defendant was classified as, quote, free of mental illness while imprisoned at the Plainfield Correctional Facility; however, in 2014, he completed dual diagnosis program at the department. He has no known prior diagnoses.

Substance abuse. He has an extensive history of substance abuse. First tried marijuana at age eight. Did not use the substance again until age nine. Also began consuming alcohol with neighborhood buddies. Last consumed alcohol in 2021. He drank daily prior to that.

First snorted cocaine at age 11. Last snorted sometime in 2020. Used the substance at least three times a week. At age 13, he first used methamphetamine. It was easy to obtain because his mom's friends had become like family. Last use of methamphetamine was on February 2 of 2021. Used the drug daily prior to that date of last use.

First used crack cocaine at age 19. Few times used the drug. Subsequent to that, he began abusing prescription opiates, Percocet, Vicodin. Defendant stated he was, quote,

really big on Xanax for three consecutive years. Stopped using for a long time but relapsed prior to his arrest for this offense. Stated one time use of heroin at age 38. Also used K2 spice regularly.

He has attended Marion County Addiction to Recovery Center, inpatient treatment program, also began attending intensive outpatient treatment at Meridian Services followed by Relap Prevention. He's currently receptive to participation in substance abuse treatment.

Education. He completed the 10th grade of high school in New Castle, went to the Job Corps at age 16. He was taught plumbing by a master plumber. He expressed interest in exploring vocational training programs in the building trades while housed at the Bureau of Prisons. He denies any enlistment in the military. At the IDOC, he completed the LLS2 program. Also, he indicates he obtained his GED in 2017.

Employment history. He has a brief employment history. He worked at a foundry, other factory work in Anderson, Indiana. Also worked at fast food restaurants and remodeled bathrooms as well.

Financial condition. He has no monthly income or expenditures, denies having any assets. Does not have the ability to pay a fine within the guideline range.

Sentencing options. Under the statute, the minimum term of imprisonment is 15 years. Maximum term is 30 years in

prison. Count 6. The maximum term of imprisonment is 1 2 20 years. Guidelines. Based on total offense level of 43 and a criminal history category of V, the guideline imprisonment 3 4 range is life. Because each count has a fixed statutory 5 maximum term of imprisonment, as to Count 1, that's 6 360 months, as to Count 2, that's 240 months, the advisory 7 quideline range cannot be life. Therefore, the quideline 8 range becomes 600 months or 50 years. 9 Supervised release. Under the statute, Counts 1 and 10 6, five years to life per count. Under the guidelines, five 11 years to life per count. He is ineligible for probation under 12 the guidelines and under the statute. 13 Paragraphs 122 and 123 recite the mandatory and 14 proposed conditions of supervision. And, Mr. Smith, have you 15 been able to read and discuss with your attorney the mandatory 16 and proposed conditions of supervision? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, we talked about that. 18 THE COURT: Do you have any objection to those 19 conditions? 20 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Edgar, did you see any of those 22 conditions that would generate an objection or cause any 23 concern? 24 MR. EDGAR: No, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Paragraph 124. Fines under the statute,

Count 1 and 6, maximum fine is \$250,000 per count. There's a mandatory special assessment fee of \$100 per count for a total of \$200. Defendant is also subject to the provisions of the Justice For Victims of Trafficking Act. However, he is indigent. He's also subject to provisions of the Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018. Guideline provisions, fine range is 50,000 to \$500,000. Restitution, under the statute and under the guidelines, of course, is mandatory and shall be ordered.

As I indicated earlier, no objections from the Government, and we've taken care and addressed the objections filed by the defendant, several of which were withdrawn.

Mr. Smith, those are the findings of the Court based on the information contained in the Presentence Investigation Report. Do you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the Court's findings based on that information contained in the Presentence Report?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: At this stage of the proceeding,

Mr. Smith, you have a right and an opportunity to make any

comment to the Court you wish regarding the issue of the

appropriate sentence, or for that matter, anything you wish to

discuss. You can also present evidence in support of those

comments, and, of course, you can have your attorney speak on

your behalf as well, and the Government has that same right

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and opportunity to make a comment regarding the appropriate sentence and present evidence in support of those comments. Do you understand all this? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Edgar, any presentation here today? MR. EDGAR: I do have a presentation, Judge, but I think it might work best if Mr. Smith goes first. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Smith, do you have a statement you wish to make? THE DEFENDANT: Before I read this -- I wrote this about -- probably about 26 months ago. There's nothing that I can say that's excusable for anything that I've done or anything that I've said. I've made myself look like a monster, and that's -- that's probably the best look for me, but I still would like to read this. Like I said, no matter what I say, nothing is ever going to take away the pain that I've caused this family or this child. As I read this aloud, I stand here before all of you regretful, ashamed, and appalled by my aberrant choices. I'm beyond disgusted by my depraved, detestable, and perverse If only death could show how sorry I truly am for these vile and abominable actions, I'd willingly give up life.

I only wish the words "I'm sorry" and "please forgive me" were

enough. I only know too well that these words can never

express how truly sorry I am. I desperately need the forgiveness of the little girl in this case, the family of this child, the court in which I'm standing, my family, and everyone else I've hurt. I pray day and night for divine healing for anyone I have affected in all of this. I don't ask for forgiveness because I want to get out of this trouble I'm in. I ask it because I don't want hurt or anger to control someone else's life like it has mine. Unlike me, I hope and pray that the child in this case never has to know or remember there was a monster on the other end of a phone.

When I first got incarcerated on this case, I was in denial. All I wanted to do is point the -- point a finger and play a blame game, but in my heart and soul, I knew the child in this case deserved my accountability. I was wrong, and I know I deserve punishment.

At one point I mentally refused to write an apology letter, not because I wasn't sorry or ashamed of myself, but because -- well, actually, because of two things. One, the entire time I was living with my codefendant in Anderson, Indiana, I was high. And I'm not using that as an excuse. It's just the truth of it. I really don't remember much of anything that was said or written. Not an excuse because I'm the one who decided to start using again. And the second reason is because, to me, an apology is something that comes from the heart, not something that is written from a pen.

Just a few words didn't seem adequate enough, but after seeing some of the stuff I wrote, my whole perspective changed. My mind and heart were flooded with emotions I still am unable to comprehend. In that moment, while reading the grotesque things that I had written, I not only thought I was a disgusting, vile person, but I knew I was and so much more than that, less than a person, a nothing, a loser of the worst kind. A monster and a coward befits me very well.

I'm more than sorry for the pain an embarrassment
I've caused. There isn't a moment that goes by that I don't
regret any of this, even if it's only cost me my heart, soul,
and life, it's a price worth paying. This is why it was
imperative for me to write this apology letter because
standing up with no more than an "I'm sorry" and "please
forgive me" just wasn't sufficient or sincere enough in my
eyes. I don't deserve anyone in this case's forgiveness, but
I'm begging for it. Please. All I ask is for forgiveness.

Thank you for your time and for listening to this letter. I pray that God also forgives me and watches over and blesses all of you. Nothing can take away what I've done.

I've ruined my character. I've ruined standing relationships with my dad, my grandmother. I haven't talked to my son in two and a half years, and I deserve it. Like I said, it's not going to take away the pain, but I hope the child doesn't have to grow up like I did, afraid and not trusting, because she

deserves better than that, but thank you for your time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. Edgar?

MR. EDGAR: May I have just a moment to plug in here?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. EDGAR: Do I need to be made live here? There we

Mr. Smith speaks well on his own behalf, so I don't need to belabor a lot of the points that he's made. I've also filed a Sentencing Memorandum trying to highlight some of the better parts of his character, and I won't belabor those points.

What I would hope to illustrate today, Your Honor, at the risk -- I want to provide some context. At the risk of being repetitive or obvious to some or abrasive to others, I hope the Court and the parties and the observers will indulge me, but one I thing I can say with certainty about Mr. Smith is, from the start, he was programmed to accept responsibility for this. We know that because he went and did the proffer. The proffer went well. There is a part of his character mixed into all the horrible parts of his character in that gray area that I suspect exists in all of us that makes criminal behavior seem perhaps reasonable under some circumstances. Buried and mixed into all of that bad character is this concept of I'm accepting responsibility, but I think things

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

should be correct and true. And honestly, that's some of the times where he -- where I get frustrated with him because in my mind, as the lawyer, maybe a little jaded, I say, it's not going to affect the bottom line. Why are you fighting over I mean, that's what I'm thinking. I don't tell him those words but -- because it's his case. I should trust him. So we end up -- with the perception that we're fighting over things that ultimately don't move the dial even a little bit, and it may look like it's an attempt to dodge or evade or manipulate or plead to this so he can cap his exposure at this and so forth. I think that's a fair reading. It's a fair argument. I know the Government is going to make that argument. It's logical. This is what I see from Mr. Smith, is he says -- you know, when he describes that video image of not actually displaying sexual activity, you hear from the witness, that's probably a reasonable perception on his part. And that's why he dug his heels on it, even though it didn't affect the outcome at all. None of our arguments affected the outcome because he's at the top of the guidelines. appreciate the Court's patience. THE COURT: You explained that to him. His guideline was so high, that even if all the enhancements were taken away, he'd still be at Level 43 pretty much? MR. EDGAR: Right, right. It's all been academic, but that's important to him.

1 THE COURT: Yeah. Absolutely.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's his case. I've learned to respect MR. EDGAR: that. So one of the things today that I did learn -- I started as a young deputy prosecutor, and I was assigned to some cases where children were victims, and the pattern became obvious later on down the line as those children ended up in the system as defendants because even though I made the effort, they were frequently sent right back into the environment that they came from, the environment that abused them, the environment that created their -- the challenges and the harder parts of their character, and there's very little help for children like that. And Mr. Smith, even though he's a grown man and can be stubborn and abrasive and, you know, has -- he's here, you know, exposed warts and all. He was that child, and it's my job to try and point that out, that that is a factor that determined the trajectory of his life. It's very, very difficult to alter that trajectory. And the flip side of that argument is, well, then he should know what he's doing when he victimizes children, but we know from experience that doesn't hold true for everybody. Some people simply cannot escape that victimization, especially when the system is not really designed or programmed, especially on the state level, to fully address those issues like a federal penitentiary might be with a sexual offender management program, high quality counseling, and evaluations. So that's

one -- one pattern that I think -- one bit of context that I think is very important.

After being lucky enough to get on the panel sometime around -- the CJA counsel panel sometime around 2005, I was new to the system. I didn't understand it, and I kept getting crushed at sentencing because these guideline scores kept coming back like a ratchet effect, upward, upward, upward, and I'm embarrassed to admit that it took me several years to recognize this pattern.

THE COURT: Certainly not uncommon.

MR. EDGAR: Right. Because I was used to state court where it was more of a -- you know, a lot more discretion for the judge, especially back then when everything was mandatory.

So around 2010, 2011, I was asked to do a CLF for federal offenders, and I chose the topic of the United States Guidelines Sentencing Commission because I wanted to figure this out. Because what I was finding when I go on the internet -- I cite this in my briefs regularly, but I think it helps to actually see it. This is the National Institute of Justice, which is a department of the same DOJ that comes to, you know, represent the United States, and they agree with me that these monster sentences, these terrifying sentences do not deter crime. It's simply a fact. It's right here in plain English, still today available on their website, that what deters people is the certainty of getting caught.

So you can make the sentence -- we can make the sentence as long as you want, but it's not going to deter Mr. Smith, and it's not going to deter anybody who hears about Mr. Smith. So this is a fallacy that somehow creeps into this process is somehow a truth, even though there's no evidence that I've ever seen that lengthy sentences actually deter crime.

So then we go to the -- the history of the guidelines commission, and this is, you know, me risking pointing out the obvious, but it came into being in the '80s during the Reagan era, and was sort of during that -- that time of the very beginning of the war on drugs. We used terms of phraseology related to war. So war on drugs. The war on crime.

So we create this Sentencing Guideline Commission. It is presidential appointments, and so we have -- they're the ones who essentially set the standard starting out under the Reagan era. Then we have George Bush, the first, and then we have the Clinton era in the '90s where, even though there was a shift in politics and sort of the political party structure, the dominant party structure, there's still this war on crime concept. I mean, I was there in the '90s. I was lawyering in the '90s. We all bought into the fact that long sentences were going to cure this problem, and now we know that's not true.

So for the first 15, 20 years, and then we have

George W. Bush, we have this appointee sort of environment for the guidelines where the history, the tradition, the culture is let's continue with this ratcheting upwards, ratchet up, ratchet up. You know this is a problem, Your Honor, because any sentencing scheme, any sentencing guidelines that doesn't — that very specifically and, quote, unquote, scientifically assigns points ratcheting upward for certain behavior but is incapable of assigning points ratcheting downward for mitigating behavior is problematic. That can't be a just sentencing system. It cannot be.

The evidence of this is the guidelines recognizes mitigators. There's like 25 of them. But none of them come with points. And I think that's a problem. Childhood trauma, behavior driven by drug addiction. They know that these are factors. These are mitigators, but no points. Why can't we assign points to that? Four points off for being abused sexually as a child. Would that be so foreign a concept?

So I did this presentation. I hope you'll forgive me for going through it, but this was a snapshot of the guidelines commission at the time. So meet your United States sentencing commission. This was done in 2011, and I've updated it for the second half. It was also called "Who Let the Fox Guard the Henhouse."

Back then, eight members. The first was Judge Patti Saris, former chief AUSA, vice chair, retired career AUSA.

Judge Howell, former award winning AUSA. Dabney Friedrich, former AUSA. Isaac Fulwood, retired police chief with 29 years on the force. Jonathan Wroblewski, current director of policy, Attorney General, DOJ employee -- an active DOJ employee at the time. Judge Ricardo Hinojosa, career judge from Texas, described as unknown, but he was from Texas. We had Supreme Court Justice Kentanji Brown Jackson before she was so famous, and she was the only one of all of the members who would admit to having ever represented a criminal defendant. And when you look at someone's bio, that's what they're proud of. That's what they're proud of the most. So no one else has that in their bio except for her.

So the final tally back there was Government six, defendant one. Of course, we're not going to get any reform under an environment like that, and one unknown from Texas.

Currently, we have Carlton Reeves, who's a judge. He's former U.S. attorney, chief of the civil division. No mention of defense practice. Judge Felipe Restrepo. He's a former assistant federal defender, so there's some -- some movement there. And Laura Mate, who is the director of the Sentencing Resource Council for the Federal Public and Community

Defenders. So we have two people who seem to understand the defense side of things. Claire Murray. Her -- highlights of her career are all related to the Attorney General, including participating in their honors program. Candice Wong, senior

leadership positions for the United States Department of
Justice. She's been there many years, and she's occupied
leadership roles. Patricia Kushwaha. She's a career parole
commission. And Scott A.C. Meisler is a current employee of
the Attorney General, deputy chief. And so today's tally is 5
to 2.

So this is my hope, to provide some context as to why when a client panics and freaks out and starts to distrust the system and say, maybe I should go to trial. What's the difference? They say things like, well, what's -- if my parachute fails to open at 30,000 feet versus 10,000 feet, what's the difference? This is a phrase that resonates with them. If we can't possibly ever win under these guidelines, what is the point?

And, honestly, Judge, it all comes down to the judicial officer to be the balance on the system. We've had some reform over the last few years, but we still don't have point values assigned for mitigators. Very rarely. You get points for capitulating — for capitulating fully to the Government's offer, quote, unquote, but it all comes down to the to judge.

I'm not saying that Mr. Smith somehow should be perceived as deserving of a break. That's not an -- that's not an argument that I'm making. He's done some horrible things. He has some deep rooted problems, but to say, well,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the trust -- the quidelines are somehow trustworthy or a good guide for us, I do take issue with that, and I mean that respectfully to the system. I never mean to sound snarky or disrespectful. But I think that this is -- this is a situation where it illustrates very clearly that all the points that could possibly be piled on for an offense get piled on as the Court has indicated. The use of a computer? I mean, that's baked in. I think a lot of points that are --THE COURT: Well, I didn't apply that, right? MR. EDGAR: Correct. Right, right, right. clearly I'm stating something that the Court already has taken into account. But I do think a lot of this sort of launching -- launching a defendant in a case like this up to the top of the quidelines, these are all points that -- or many of them are just inherent in the behavior of looking at child pornography or seeking to produce it. I think it's all sort of connected. Very unusual to find a case where they only did it once. You do it twice, it's a pattern. And then it's counted in multiple places, five points each. think that that's a system that is -- that I can explain to my client as fair. I just can't. The phrase that I use -- and you'll forgive me -when I introduce the guidelines to my clients, I say you're not going to like this because these are rules written by

prosecutors for prosecutors. I know people in this room will

```
disagree with me on that, but that's my perspective based on
 1
 2
    what I've -- the research that I've done, and it's my client's
 3
    perspective. So I don't think that the guidelines are really
    an effective tool for us today, Judge. I don't -- I don't
 4
 5
    remember the last time I offered a number for a sentence,
    especially on a case like this, so I won't do that today, but
 6
 7
    I would ask you to consider that Mr. Smith has offered what
 8
    appears to be a very sincere and well considered description
 9
    of his remorse.
                     Thank you.
                         Thank you, Mr. Edgar. Ms. Preston, on
10
             THE COURT:
11
    behalf of the Government?
12
             MS. PRESTON: Yes, Your Honor. Would Your Honor like
13
    me to present first or would Your Honor like to hear the
14
    victim impact statement from the adopted parents?
15
             THE COURT: Victim impact statement probably would be
16
    best.
17
             MS. PRESTON: And for the record, this is Minor
18
    Victim 1's adoptive parents. I'm going to ask that he not
19
    introduce himself by his last name so we can keep that off of
20
    the record in public space.
21
             THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.
22
             SPEAKER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
23
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
24
             SPEAKER: Before I deliver our statement, there's a
25
    couple things that I would like to address, if possible. Your
```

Honor, if you would find it appropriate, we would like to give you a photo to look at in reference while I deliver our statement today. I told Ms. Preston long before we came in here today, you have seen our daughter in a very unfavorable light, and we would like for you to be able to see her the way that we see her. So would you find that appropriate if I gave you something to look at to reference?

THE COURT: That's fine.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I would also like to explain something that stuck out to me while we prepared our statement and that is how we refer --

THE COURT: How old is your daughter now?

SPEAKER: She's five. And that is how we reference our daughter in our statement. Our daughter has a name. It's a beautiful name. It's part of who she is. It's a part of her story, and as much as I would like to use her name in this statement, the defendant in this case has not earned the right to ever hear our daughter's name. So with that being said, I'm going to simply refer to her as our daughter.

So, Your Honor, we are here today to share how the defendant's actions have deeply affected our daughter, our family, and our daily lives. No words can fully express the pain and fear that we carry every day, but we hope to help you understand the lasting damage the defendant has caused on our

family. As our daughter's parents, we face an unimaginable reality that we must prepare ourselves for the difficult questions that she will ask as she grows older. One day she'll want to understand what happened to her. She'll want to know her story, and we will be left to navigate the emotional and psychological toll that this will have on her life. No parent should ever have to carry that burden. No child should ever have to know that this is part of their story, and, yet, because of the actions of the defendant, it is a reality that we cannot escape.

The defendant has stolen the innocence of childhood, not just for our daughter, but for us as parents and us as a family. She is now to the age where she wants to do things that every child should be able to do. She wants to have sleepovers with her friends. She wants to be able to play outside on her own, even things like set up a lemonade stand in our neighborhood. These are simple joys that every child should be able to experience without fear and every parent should be excited to experience with their child, but because of the actions of the defendant, we cannot allow our daughter these simple joys of childhood.

We are constantly on guard questioning everyone around us and making decisions, not out of trust, but out of fear. Even everyday moments that should be filled with love and laughter have become reminders of the harm that's been

caused. Something as simple as painting our daughter's toenails has become difficult because her feet were such a focus of the exploitation caused against her. I even struggle calling our daughter "princess," a term that was once affectionate, but is now tainted by how the defendant referred to her. The small precious parts of her childhood have been stolen from us by the actions of the defendant.

The anxiety that we live with is constant and overwhelming. When we take our daughter to a park or museum, most parents would feel comfortable giving their children a little bit of independence, but if our daughter is out of our sight even for a moment, we are overcome with panic, afraid that someone might take her or harm her, and that fear is not irrational. It is a direct result of the defendant's actions and the trauma that he's inflicted on our family.

And outside of today, the defendant has shown zero remorse for his actions that have caused so much harm to an innocent child. The only time he's acted remorseful is when he didn't want others to hear the evidence against him or to have his messages read out loud, and while he may have the privilege to ask others not to hear those messages, we don't have the privilege of ever forgetting them. We live with the weight of those words and the reality of his actions every single day. And throughout this process, in my opinion, the defendant has made a mockery of this court. He's played games

claiming he would plead guilty only to change his mind. He's wasted Government resources and valuable time preparing for trial only to once again reverse course. His actions show that he only cares for himself. And, again, outside of today at no point has he considered the profound and lasting harm that he has inflicted on our daughter and on our family.

But despite everything she's endured and despite the innocence the defendant tried to steal from her, our daughter has blossomed into a funny, kind, and loving human, and we are committed to raising our daughter to know and never question that she is chosen, cherished, and deeply loved. And every single day we thank God for his protection over her, and we vow as her parents to always protect her.

The defendant tried to take something from her, but he did not succeed in taking her spirit or her future. Your Honor, the emotional way that this crime will never leave us. There is no sentence long enough to undue the damage or to make us feel safe again. And while the defendant may one day finish his sentence, we will continue to live with the result of his actions for the rest of our lives. If it were possible, we would ask for a life sentence because we have been given one.

So, Your Honor, we ask the Court to recognize the profound and permanent damage that this crime has caused, and we urge you to impose the maximum possible sentence, not just

as a punishment for the defendant but as a measure of justice for our daughter and the life she deserves.

Thank you for the opportunity.

THE COURT: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. PRESTON: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, it is the position as set forth in our lengthy brief that a sentence of 600 months imprisonment, which is a guideline sentence, is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes set forth in the statute. And, of course, Mr. Edgar and I have had many discussions about the guidelines. We've had -- not just in this case, but in other cases. I think very critically about the guidelines and how they apply to each individual case. I just want to say in response to his argument that there are -- there are reasons why the guidelines and the enhancements in this particular They are randomized. So it's not inherent in crime exist. the behavior. As you know, Your Honor, I prosecute many crimes against children, and it does matter in this case that this child was only 18 months old. That enhancement matters and should count because it increases the harm. It does matter that a sex act was involved because not every crime -a sexual exploitation crime against a child includes a sex It did here, and that matters because it increases the harm. And it does matter that there was a pattern because that is 577 times she was exploited instead of one, and so it

matters. The pattern of activity matters. And so he has earned those enhancements. And I'll say that, of course, although, I agree with Mr. Edgar that there aren't points in subtraction necessarily the ones that he was speaking of, but that's where 3553(a) comes in, and, of course, Your Honor considers those matters in mitigation and so do I.

So I'll turn to those factors, 3553(a), because it is not my position, nor is it the Government's position, that this defendant deserves a sentence of 600 months simply because the guidelines say that that's reasonable. It's my position because I think that's what's right.

Turning to the nature and circumstances of this offense, the nature and circumstances of it weigh heavily in favor of a sentence of 600 months imprisonment. What the evidence demonstrates and has demonstrated is that this defendant is a dangerous pedophile. He has a pervasive, long-standing sexual interest in prepubescent children, the youngest of children. Children who are so young they can't self-report. Children who are so fragile and tiny, they can't even understand what is happening to their bodies while it's happening to them. But, Judge, someday those children do grow up, and they will know full well what happened to them and what that meant.

In 2020, this defendant did not have easy access to the tiniest of children, to children who cannot report, so he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had to gain it. And he did that through predatory behavior, Your Honor. That's what this was. He sought out a mother, Jamie Powell, of five children who, quite frankly, Judge, is a mess of a human being. And I'll talk about her at the time of her sentencing. But she had so much -- she was so much of a mess of a person and of a mother that two of those youngest children have been taken away from her, removed from her custody because of endangerment. And they were supposed to be safe in the custody of the Department of Child Services, but, of course, their mother was the only person allowed to see them under supervised visits. And, Judge, this defendant knew all of that. That's bourne out in the messaging that I put in my brief. And the defendant, as part of his predatory behavior, first, had to convince Ms. Powell that he loved her, and that's what he told her. And he did such a good job and manipulated her in such a way that she believed that he was her boyfriend and asked him to move in. And you saw from the messaging, she was interested and said in her messaging to him that what she wanted out of this relationship was a trusting, loving adult relationship. That's on page 25 of my brief. She wanted to do things like cuddle with Mr. Smith. But that is not what Mr. Smith wanted. But to get what he wanted, he had to go through Powell, and he had to manipulate her, and he had to use her, and that's what he did.

Undeterred by the fact that Powell's children were in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DCS custody and could only be seen in a supervised setting, that didn't even stop him. He began pressuring Powell to fulfill deviant sexual interest in bestiality, incest, and pedophilia. Little by little -- and I try to lay it out as best I could in my brief -- he pressed Powell to engage in more and more and more deviant and criminal behavior. want to be clear today that Ms. Powell bears equal responsibility. That was that child's mother. So I don't want to detract from that. It's just that her motivations to commit these crimes are very different than Smith's. Powell's motivations were that she wanted to please Mr. Smith at any cost, any cost, including putting Smith's deviant sexual desires before the safety and well-being of her own children. Whereas, Smith's motivations are purely sexual. He is a pedophile. He has a sexual interest and obsession in young children, including Powell's children.

As you saw in the messaging, he began talking to Powell about bestiality first, and he asked her to engage in sex acts with his dog, and she agreed. Then he admitted to Powell that his goal was to get her to engage in incest by molesting her own children. Desperate to please him, having zero regard for her children, she agreed. And at this defendant's behest, she began molesting Minor Victim 1, 18 months old, in the presence of her other child, Minor Witness 1, who is also incredibly young and while they were in

DCS custody. Smith couldn't be in their physical presence. The best he could do at that moment, the best he could do was to ask Powell to produce child sex abuse material of that molestation, come home, and distribute it to Smith, and she agreed. And that is what is at the core of this conspiracy, the criminal agreement that Powell would satisfy Smith's sexual desires by molesting her own child, recording it, and sharing those images and video with Smith so he could enjoy them, and that's what happened.

This is lengthy, longstanding behavior. For months and months this went on. And at least 25 occasions that we can see forensically and by comparing what is happening on the phone to the visits she had at the Laser Center. 25 occasions she molested her own toddler-aged child and produced child sex abuse material as part of their jointly undertaken criminal conspiracy. 25 visits, 577 images and videos. 486 of them he stored on his phone. Judge, that is 577 crimes spread over months of abuse. There just aren't words. This poor tiny child and her poor brother were there and had to experience all of it. They were already scared. They were already confused being in the custody of strangers, and he knew that. He knew that they must be going through that, and yet, he added to that abuse by asking their mother to sexually abuse Minor Victim 1.

But even that horrifying criminal behavior wasn't

enough for him. As you saw in our brief, Smith wasn't satisfied with that either. He wanted to engage, as he said, the words "immediately" on page 28 in sex acts not just with Minor Victim 1 and Minor Witness 1 but also with Powell's teenage child, who has been identified as H.P. in our brief. He pressed Smith over and over and over to continue to not only molest Minor Victim 1 but to keep adding in more of her children. And he said, "No, Jamie Lee. You don't understand. I, like, literally am trying to find a way to make this happen, like, within the next week. Like, I don't think you understand the severeness of that, why it's not good for me to be here, and for God's sake, I want to fuck your two-year old daughter and your little boy." Those are his words.

Now, she should have said, oh, my goodness. That's

Now, she should have said, on, my goodness. That's it. That is enough. You're right. I'm out of here, but she didn't. She agreed. And that's why she's part and parcel responsible for this, too. But the only reason she didn't agree to add her third child to the mix, to involve H.P., her teenage aged child, was she was afraid that H.P. would tell. H.P. was old enough to self-report. Minor Victim 1 and Minor Witness 1 were not.

She kept offering up Minor Victim 1 to Smith as though it was -- as though she was an object. Powell said, I'm offering you Minor Victim 1 and you want H.P., too. And Smith said, "I know you want what you want, and I know you

want your two-year old daughter to be involved in our love life, and I love that about you." And Powell said, "I've known you wanted to throw H.P. in, and I don't want to." And simply because she would tell, and her other children couldn't. But Smith was willing to go there and take that risk and engage in more sex acts with additional children who were under Powell's care.

Judge, even Minor Victim 1, who was incredibly young at the time, knew something was wrong, and he's going to have to live with that, too. He is watching his younger 18-month old sister being abused, and he had the courage to even speak up and ask Powell, "Mommy, what are you doing? What are you doing?" Causing her to flinch back because she realizes that even a child of that age knows when something is wrong. And he's going to have to live with that as well, that he was powerless to help his sister and help himself.

And, Judge, it took Powell's arrest to save those children, and I say Powell intentionally because not even Smith's incarceration in February of 2021 when he was picked up for that probation violation was enough to deter him. They continued to communicate, and Smith continued to press Minor Victim 1, even when he was in jail, and so I don't care what he said to you today, Judge. He is not going to sit here in this courtroom and blame what he did on using methamphetamine. First of which, there are a lot of meth users out there, and

that doesn't make them pedophiles. He's a pedophile. That's what caused this criminal behavior. And he wasn't high on meth when he was in jail on April 16th of 2021, and said, Before I start this message -- this is from GTL messages -- I want to ask you for something. If you're serious about me being with Minor Victim 1, I want you to completely surrender to what I want you to do with Minor Witness 1. I think it's only fair. Like, I mean everything. No questions asked. And I want North, his dog, or any like him involved from time to time. This is a person, who even after incarceration, is telling her I want to molest your children. I want you to molest your children, and I want them to engage in acts in bestiality from jail. Jail wasn't even enough to deter him.

It was those messages and others like them that were thankfully flagged by staff at the Indiana Department of Correction and that is what led to quick work by the ISP detectives. They searched Powell's house. They arrested Powell. They saved this child.

Judge, the nature and circumstances of this offense cry out for a sentence well above 600 months, but Smith has already been benefited by the application of his strategic decision to plead guilty to Counts 1 and 6 and our decision to not move forward with Counts 2, 3, and 4 because, yes, at that point, even though his attempts over and over to jerry-rig the system, to only plead to the counts he felt like he should

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

plead to, he finally got to a point where I felt justice could be served, and he was at least accepting and being held accountable for all his criminal conduct, including possessing more than 5,000 images and videos of other children on his So Count 6 was incredibly important to us as well. And he's responsible for their suffering, too. responsible for the possessing and viewing 5,000 images and videos depicting equally terrible sexual acts against other prepubescent children he didn't even know. And during that same horror, horror that causes normal people, Judge, to cry out in shock and in disgust and with sadness, that's the horror that Mr. Smith makes him sexually aroused. These videos and images shock the conscious to normal people, but a pedophile, who is a criminal like Mr. Smith, it causes him to be sexually aroused. He deserves every minute of that 600 months.

I'll turn to the history and characteristics of this defendant, beginning with his personal history and mitigation, and there is mitigation here. Mr. Smith had a scatter shot family history with abuse and a lot of drug use, death, sadness, and that's -- if all true, that is absolutely terrible. I still say this in these cases, Your Honor.

Assuming Mr. Smith was molested as a child, that is awful. It is a terrible thing that this Court should consider, but it is still a choice to victimize somebody else. He made that

choice 577 times.

He reports suicide attempts, drug use, and despite numerous rehabilitation classes, domestic violence prevention courses, he still was hooked on drugs, still committing new offenses.

Paragraph 102 of the PSR details the many attempts that have been made to prevent recidivism by this defendant, and they've all failed. They've all failed. So much intervention and none of it has worked. An aggravation, turning to Smith's criminal history, it's dreadful. His criminal history is on pages 16 through 22 and shows a lifelong pattern of criminal behavior and the commission of new offenses while on probation and parole. He has no respect for the law. None. And I believe that his criminal history under represents truly who he is because he's receiving zero points for much of it.

Judge, his criminal history involves the distribution of meth, theft, residential entry, battery of a police officer, and then parole and probation revocation after revocation after revocation. This is someone who has no respect for the law whatsoever.

Additionally, and an aggravation, let's talk about his character. I've talked about what he did, but it's also important to understand who he is. Your Honor, this case would have been terrible enough if Smith had he, himself,

molested Minor Victim 1 or directed another person to molest her, but that's not what he did here. It's worse. It's worse. He did something even more shocking and atrocious, which is to have her own mother do it. That's just horrible, Judge, to direct a mother to molest a child. There are no words for that. It's an offense that shocks the conscious and says a great deal about Smith. And I know he stood up here today, and he apologized and is asking for forgiveness, but I think his behavior over the months and with this case, I would tell you if I thought he meant it. I don't. Some defendants I do think come up here and are sincerely apologetic. I don't think so. I've seen no evidence of sincere remorse or a true understanding of the depravity of his conduct. It's excuse after excuse after excuse.

This child, thanks to Mr. Smith and Ms. Powell, will now have to live with the knowledge that her own mother, her own mother did this to her, that her own mother prioritized his sexual deviant desires over her safety. And it's just hard to think of anything worse. And despite what he said to you here today, that he hopes she won't know, she's going to know. She's going to find out. Despite our best efforts, some day those poor parents who are sitting back there are going to have to have a really difficult series of conversations with her, and that is life-lasting pain, pain that she is going to endure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Judge, the messaging between Mr. Smith and Ms. Powell is shocking. The things he said that he wanted to do to an innocent 18-month old, they're just horrifying. To look at that child, an 18-month old, as a sexual object, it's confounding to me. To refer to her vagina as baby -- and I'm not going to say the word. A "C" word. It's disturbing. talk about sucking her "P" and making that toddler drink her own mother's "P," there aren't words to encapsulate that level of depravity. And to plan on molesting that child and forcing her to engage in bestiality. I won't repeat all the terrible things he said. I put some of them, not even all of them, in a brief, but it's not to spare Mr. Smith. He should have to sit and listen to them, but I'm not going to do it to her parents. I'm not going to do it. But you saw those messages and you know what he planned to do if he ever got out. It was just going to get worse.

Thank goodness he was arrested and Powell was arrested before Minor Victim 1 and her brother were sent home, before they were sent home and subjected to more abuse.

Judge, turning to deterrence and promoting respect for the law. I don't -- my point on deterrence is I don't think Smith can be deterred. I think that's demonstrated in his criminal history, conviction after conviction, lengthy sentences, including a 16-year sentence, probation, parole, rehab, intervention. They've all failed. And so I think this

is a person who has demonstrated he can't be deterred, so he must be removed from society because society needs protection from him, and that's why we are asking for the sentence we are in this case. Society needs permanent protection from Mr. Smith. His level of obsession won't go away. He won't age out of this behavior. He can recidivate even when he is older. Keep in mind, he was able to commit all these crimes, and he wasn't even in the room with this toddler. He wanted to be. That was his plan, but he was arrested and prevented from doing that.

I'll end with just punishment, Your Honor. For years now, Minor Victim 1's adoptive parents have shown pictures of her to us. They've kept us updated on her development and her progress, and she is, as I'm sure you saw, just a bright, beautiful child, and I am so grateful for her adoptive parents. I am so relieved and grateful they are in her life. They so clearly love her, but as you heard them say so eloquently today, they face such a battle. Someday she will be old enough to ask questions, and she will ask those questions. What happened to my mom, my real mom? What did she do? What did she do to me? And why did she do it? And no matter how you address it, she's going to ask those questions, and they're going to be faced with that reality, but more important, Minor Victim 1 will be faced with it

impact her, what it will do to her, to live with the knowledge that your mom sexually abused you to make him happy, that she did so without even putting so much up as a small fight and that she did it for him.

He preyed on this already broken family. He is a predator. He is responsible for that, just as Powell is, and there has to be just punishment for it. The United States is seeking a guideline sentence of 600 months imprisonment, a lifetime of supervised release. We are also asking that his sentence is to be served consecutively for his undischarged term of imprisonment for dealing in methamphetamine, possession of methamphetamine, and battery of a police officer, completely separate offenses, and he hasn't discharged that sentence of imprisonment. We are asking, and the defendant has agreed, to a restitution amount of \$10,000, and for all of those reasons, Your Honor, we are asking that that sentence be imposed. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Preston.

Mr. Edgar, would you and Mr. Smith come back up?

All right. The Court has reviewed the information

contained in the Presentence Investigation Report, has

consulted the advisory guidelines, has heard comments from

counsel for the defendant, counsel for the Government,

defendant did make a statement, also there was a victim impact

statement made as well.

The Court now turns to factors set forth in 3553(a), factors to be considered in imposing a sentence. The Court shall impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in the code. Court shall consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant.

Nature and circumstances of the offense, of course, we've gone over that many times today, very thoroughly today. Defendant was involved in a conspiracy to commit sexual exploitation of a minor and also possession of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct. Count 1, of course, involves Minor Victim 1. Count 6 involves hundreds and hundreds of children all across the world who are involved involuntarily, obviously, in performing and being photographed in sexually explicit positions and poses.

I've been doing this for -- sentencing people for -- on criminal convictions for 35 years. Prior to that, I was a defense attorney. I represented people, such as yourself. I represented murderers. I represented almost every kind of individual and crime that comes through our system, so I've basically seen and heard just about everything over all these years of my 45 years of law practice and judiciary. It's hard to believe it's that long, but time marches on. I have to say that this might be the most depraved criminal conduct I've seen in all those years. And believe me, I've seen and heard

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of horrible conduct. I've seen pictures and photos and videos and brutal murders. Obviously, sex offenses as well. But this is at the top. Not only was this an 18-month old victim but you manipulated your codefendant, Ms. Powell, to -- and basically ordered her -- I read the exhibits. I read your texts. You're directing her to commit these acts on Minor Victim 1. You can't deny that. And to direct a mother to do this to her own child, an infant, toddler, for your own sexual gratification. You just didn't want to watch -- look at these things. This was for your own sexual gratification. And you described yourself as a depraved individual, as a monster. I think those are probably pretty accurate depictions here. There is no explanation. There is no -- it's just hard to comprehend what you did here and how you did it and for how long you did it. Obviously, you're a pedophile. You have a long-term interest in minor children. You had many images and videos in your possession of children involved in sexually explicit images on your phone. I'm sure those were viewed quite often as well. And then, of course, Minor Victim 1. So two separate offenses involving many, many different individuals -- children here.

I'm not going to go into -- your attorney and

Ms. Preston indicated that maybe you were trying to game the

system here a little bit in terms of whether you were going to

plead guilty or not plead guilty. Believe me, you didn't game

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the system here. I've been around long enough to know when someone is trying to game the system or not. I believe your attorney indicated that you just didn't really know what you wanted to do and were having difficulty understanding the seriousness and the potential penalties that were involved here upon a conviction, and I understand that, and I was willing to be patient and give you an opportunity to discuss all this with your attorney, and I understand that it takes some time to understand what you did will come in front of a jury, that the evidence was extremely strong here, text -paper trail. There would be testimony from your codefendant and all that. So I was willing to give you time to figure all that out, and you finally did. It's not the result that the Government actually wanted here. I think they wanted convictions on all counts, but they came to realize, too, that efficiencies here might come into play as long as they receive convictions for Minor Victim 1, and, of course, all of the victims in Count 6 as well. So there was no -- I'm not saying you gamed the system or not. You didn't. And here we are at sentencing, and you're -- you're going to face a lengthy sentence here. There's no question about that. And I know Mr. Edgar, he's worked extremely hard representing you in this Difficult case for any criminal defense attorney to represent, and we all appreciate his representation here. History and characteristics of the defendant.

Defendant, there's no question, had a difficult, chaotic childhood involving drugs, abuse. Parents were involved with drugs. He was abused by his mother and other relatives, friends. Defendant has had a long history of substance abuse as well. But certainly, that's -- that's no excuse for his actions. The Court is convinced the defendant is a pedophile and, of course, that's a mental illness, and part of your sentence is going to be that you be evaluated for mental health treatment, as well as substance abuse treatment as well.

Defendant presented a statement today offering his remorse. That's true in every case. No one comes up here and tells me, Judge, I'm not sorry for what I did. That's not something that happens. Most people are sorry that they got caught. They're not so sorry about what they did. And as a pedophile, you understand that that's an addiction, right?

Yes, sir.

THE DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: You're addicted to child pornography, and people who have addictions, whether it's child pornography or sex addictions or alcohol and substance abuse addictions or drug addictions, there's no switch. You just can't turn that off. There's no switch that says I'm addicted, and then you push it down, and I'm no longer addicted. That's a lifelong addiction that you have.

Some people who receive treatment for their addiction

are successful. They go on about their life, and they don't relapse. Many people I see do relapse over the years, and they come back into court, and I see them again, and I see them again.

So I don't know what's going to happen with you.

Hopefully, you'll take advantage of treatment at the Bureau of

Prisons regarding your child pornography addiction and

pedophilia and substance abuse.

Need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense. I don't think we have to go much further in describing the seriousness of this offense. I could talk for another five minutes about the seriousness. I think we all agree that it's a very serious offense that you committed here, that -- not only in Count 1, Minor Victim 1, eventually, more than likely will find out what happened here with her mother and you, and certainly that will be with her for the rest of her life.

In Count 6, all these victims, as I said, they're -they don't voluntarily pose for these sexually explicit
depictions. They're forced to do that. And those are
distributed on the internet, and, of course, as we all know,
once something's on the internet, never disappears. And so
when they get to be older, and they recall all this, they go,
I wonder who's looking at me now. Those -- those thoughts

never leave either. So extremely serious offense.

Promote respect for the law. Any sentence we impose we hope promotes respect for the law. You've been in and out of courtrooms and out of jail cells for quite sometime.

You've been revoked several times. I've got concern about your respect for the law, and I'm going to consider that in determining the appropriate sentence. And, of course, any sentence we impose, the Court believes that it's a just —fair and just sentence.

Afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct. I give great weight to this factor. Once this sentence is communicated and published to the community, hopefully others who are contemplating this type of conduct or committing similar conduct will think twice before going forward because if you're caught, it's a serious penalty that's involved. I don't know how much success we're having with deterrence. The criminal numbers keep going up and up every year, but we have to continue to try to deter individuals such as yourself and others from committing similar crimes.

Protect the public from further crimes of the defendant. Mr. Smith, what makes you think I've got any confidence that once you're released, you're not going to go back to do this type of criminal activity?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't know, Your Honor. If I'm being honest, I don't know.

THE COURT: Yeah, you don't know, and we don't know. So that's certainly a factor as well that I have to consider, and I give great weight to that factor as well.

Provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. You indicated you have some desire to learn vocational skills, plumbing, construction --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- those types of things. Also, medical care. As I indicated, I'm going to ask the Bureau to evaluate you for mental health issues and also substance abuse treatment as well. You appear to be in good physical health. You indicated in your Presentence Report that no real problems on that and minor prior diagnoses as well of mental health and so the Bureau will be ordered to address those conditions as well.

And also to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants who have been convicted of similar crimes and have similar backgrounds. The Court believes a guideline sentence would not be unwarranted sentence disparity. And also restitution. And my understanding is you've agreed to make restitution?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. All right. The Court has

consulted the advisory guidelines, heard comments from counsel, has considered factors set forth in 3553(a), is now ready to impose judgment and sentence.

Mr. Edgar, do you know of any legal reason why the Court cannot impose judgment and sentence?

MR. EDGAR: I do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Preston?

MS. PRESTON: I do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Court enters judgment and conviction on Count 1, conspiracy to commit the sexual exploitation of a minor, a violation of 18 U.S. Code 2251(a) and (e) and Section 2. Court enters judgment and conviction on Count 6, possession of visual depictions of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct, a violation of 18 U.S. Code Section 2252(a)(5)(B).

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court the defendant, Richard Smith, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term 360 months on Count 1 and 240 months on Count 6, consecutive for a total of 600 months.

While incarcerated, defendant shall participate in the residential sex offender treatment program, mental health treatment, vocational training, and RDAP and prison industries. There is restitution in an agreed upon amount of \$10,000, and the Court will sign that order -- agreed upon

order today. The Court is not ordering a fine based on defendant's currently financial resources and future inability to pay in addition to the restitution obligation. He shall forfeit to the United States the following items that are currently listed in the Presentence Investigation Report, and I previously had issued a preliminary order of forfeiture, and those items will be forfeited.

Supervised release is required by statute. The Court is imposing a term of life of supervised release on each of Counts 1 and 6 concurrent upon the release from imprisonment, based on the nature of the offense, personal history and characteristics of the defendant, the need to protect the public, and to assist in the defendant's reentry into the community.

While on supervised release, defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime, shall cooperate with the collection of a DNA sample, and shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, and shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervised release and two periodic tests thereafter as directed by the probation officer.

Defendant shall also comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, United States Code Section -- 34 United States Code Section 20901.

Restitution is a condition of supervised release and defendant

will pay in accordance with a schedule of payments.

Further, defendant shall comply with the following additional conditions. And Mr. Smith, you'll recall when we reviewed your Presentence Investigation Report, I asked you if you had been able to read and discuss with your attorney the mandatory and proposed conditions of supervision?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You indicated to me you had done so?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And you had no objection?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: I can read those conditions to you or you can waive my reading of those to you.

THE DEFENDANT: I waive them.

THE COURT: You've discussed them with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Further order defendant pay a mandatory special assessment fee of \$100 per count for a total of \$200. Court is imposing a \$100 assessment per count for a total \$200 pursuant to 18 U.S. Code Section 2259(a), the Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act. Payment of this special assessment is due immediately, made directly to the clerk of the United States District Court. The Court is not imposing an assessment pursuant to 18 U.S. Code Section 3014, the Justice For Victims of Trafficking Act

because the defendant is indigent.

The sentence in this cause number shall run consecutive to his uncompleted state court sentence.

All right. You have a right to appeal the conviction and sentence in this case. You understand that, Mr. Smith?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. If you wish to appeal, discuss it with your attorney. If you wish to file an appeal, you must file a notice of appeal with the clerk of the Court within 14 days of entry of judgment in this matter. Do you understand this?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And if you wish to appeal, Mr. Edgar will file that notice for you. He will not represent you in the appeal, but he will file that notice for you.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: BOP recommendation here?

MR. EDGAR: He is requesting recommendation for FCI Tucson or FCI Elkton. We believe both of them have sex offender management programs.

THE COURT: All right. Court recommends the defendant be housed in a Bureau of Prison facility which has sex offender treatment program. There are several around the country. Defendant specifically requests Tucson, Arizona, or Elkton Bureau of Prison facility. The Bureau tries to follow

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our recommendations the best they can. However, sometimes they cannot due to space limitation or security level requirements, but they'll do their best to follow our recommendations.

All right. I've got an order here on restitution.

I'll go ahead and execute that here today. It's approved.

Any questions about anything, Mr. Smith?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I just -- I want to thank you for giving me the time that you did. I don't deserve to be on the streets, but I also don't deserve to have the picture painted of me that is painted of me. A lot of my characteristics are shown on the paper that you read -- that you read out loud that she said. 99.8 percent of it is absolutely true. But the picture that you guys have of my codefendant is not right. I don't -- from the beginning, Your Honor, I didn't care about the time. I don't deserve -- I'm not good out there. I don't deserve out there. I don't need out there. I know what I am, and I know who I am, and I'm messed up bad. But to paint a picture of somebody you guys don't know except what you see on that paperwork is not right. For you guys to -- no matter what they said, no matter what she said, nobody can kick me as far as I've kicked myself. I've done it all my life. I don't need nobody else to do it, but I'm glad somebody else sees what I see in myself, but make sure you guys paint the correct picture when it comes to other

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
people. Don't -- it's not fair for you guys to say, oh,
somebody's innocent, and I forced -- I didn't force anybody to
do --
         THE COURT: No, no, no.
         THE DEFENDANT:
                        No. No, no, no.
                                          I listened --
         THE COURT:
                    I don't think anybody --
         THE DEFENDANT: I listened to you.
         THE COURT: -- is saying Mrs. Powell --
         THE DEFENDANT: I listened to you.
         THE COURT: -- is innocent.
         THE DEFENDANT: I'm -- I should have a right to
speak.
         THE COURT: Yes.
         THE DEFENDANT: And all I'm saying is you guys are
painting the wrong picture. It doesn't matter. I was
comfortable with 160 years, but I didn't -- what I wasn't
comfortable with is accepting something I did not do. Because
I wrote something -- I tried to leave to California.
to go. I was on the run. I'm the one who went on the run.
I'm the one who had $20,000 in my pocket. I wanted to go.
Jamie begged me to stay. So the picture that you guys got
painted is wrong, and you're wrong, and it's okay, though,
because I'm going where I deserve to be, and I'm very, very
grateful and thankful for that. I'm blessed for that. And
that's all I have to say.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 2
             Mr. Edgar, anything else today?
 3
             MR. EDGAR: Nothing further from me, Judge. Thank
 4
    you.
 5
             THE COURT: Any motions on 2, 3, and 4, Ms. Preston?
 6
             MS. PRESTON: The United States moves to
 7
    dismiss Counts 2, 3, and 4 of the original indictment.
 8
             THE COURT: All right. Any objection?
 9
             MR. EDGAR: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
             THE COURT: Counts 2, 3 and 4 of the original
10
11
    indictment are dismissed on motion of the Government.
12
             We'll show him -- Mr. Smith remanded to the custody
13
    of the marshal. Thank you all very much.
             THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess.
14
15
                      *******
16
17
18
                     CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
    I, Elizabeth Taylor Culiver, RPR, FCRR, certify that the
19
20
    foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of
21
    proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
22
23
    S/s Elizabeth Taylor Culiver
                                       May 2, 2025
    ELIZABETH TAYLOR CULIVER, RPR, FCRR
24
    Official Court Reporter
    Southern District of Indiana
25
    Evansville Division
```